

-25-

4633 Hartford Subscribers			
Income Levels	Proportion of Total U.S. Families*	Proportion of Total Subscribers	Average Weekly Program Expenditure
0-\$3,999	29.1%	1.5%	\$0.00
\$4,000-\$6,999	32.5%	40.8%	1.25
\$7,000-\$9,999	21.0%	43.3%	1.23
\$10,000 and Over	17.7%	14.4%	1.18
Totals (rounded)	100.0%	100.0%	(avg.) \$1.22

* Statistical Abstract of the United States 1964, Table No. 457, p. 338.

It would appear, if the trial is any indication, that STV would appeal especially to the more than 50% of the population in the middle-income groups, and not mainly to the upper income level which includes only about 18% of the population. As to the 30% of the population in the lowest income category, Zenith and Teco state that an annual income of \$3,000 has been called a "poverty" income. Therefore many of those in the less than \$4,000 bracket in the table might not be able to afford other than basic necessities, and some might not even be able to afford TV sets, let alone STV.

75. STV opponents contend that 30% of the nation would appear unable to afford STV and that therefore authorizing STV would not be in the public interest. We do not find their arguments convincing. Among other things, we would observe that under the rules which we adopt herein, all those in the lowest income group who own TV sets will be able to continue to see ample amounts of free TV programming, so that they will not be deprived of anything, while at the same time a substantial portion of the population will be given the opportunity to view STV if it so desires. The same economic difference presently exists with regard to color TV. Many in the country who desire color sets with large screens cannot afford them.

76. Finally, we are gratified that the all-channel law is apparently acting as a stimulus to UHF development, for this was our hope when we sponsored it. ^{25/} However, our commitment to aid UHF is not limited to that law, and it is well-known that our continuing policy is to foster UHF development. We are pursuing many paths toward that end, and to the extent that STV may act as a stimulus, we will pursue that path as well. One opponent has argued that the financial resources of STV would not be used to strengthen free TV on the same station that carried on STV operations, but that they would be used to strengthen STV since STV and free TV would compete with each other, and that this would impair rather than promote the capacity of

^{25/} U.S. Census reports that in August 1966, 93.4% of households had TV sets and 33.8% of households had sets equipped for UHF reception. (Current Housing Reports, Series H-121, No. 13, February 1967.)